

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Applicant submits herewith replacement drawing sheets for FIGS. 1-5b. Please replace FIGS. 1-5b with the replacement sheets attached after the last page of this response.

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated February 17, 2006. Applicant has amended claims 1, 9 and 17. Claims 1-21 remain pending.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott et al. (U.S. 6,484,260) in view of Davis (U.S. 5,568,552) and Addy (U.S. 6,255,944). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. The applied references fail to disclose or suggest the inventions defined by Applicant's claims, and provide no teaching that would have suggested the desirability of modification to arrive at the claimed invention.

Independent claims 1, 9 and 17

First, with regard to independent claim 1, Scott in view of Davis and Addy fail to teach or suggest a policy manager component that, during a currently logged-in session of the user associated with the personal digital identifier device, directs at least one of the workstations to blank out a respective screen when a second personal digital identifier device is detected at a location within an envelope until such time as a user registered to said second personal digital identifier device is biometrically identified to have permission to view data of the currently logged-in session. Scott in view of Davis and Addy fail to teach or suggest similar elements of independent claims 9 and 17.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify that the policy manager directs the workstation to blank the screen when a *second* PID is detected during a currently logged-in session until a user associated with the second PID is identified. Support for this amendment can be found in paragraph [0039], which describes the situation where during a current session of a user, an "observer" is subsequently detected within range of the workstation within which a user is already logged-in. Paragraph [0039] describes that, in response to detecting the observer, the policy manager automatically directs the workstation to blank the screen until the user associated with the second PID is identified as having privileges sufficient to view the originally displayed data of the currently logged-in session.

In rejecting independent claims 1, 9 and 17, the Examiner correctly recognized that Scott in view of Davis failed to teach or suggest these elements. In particular, the Examiner stated that Scott only discloses a user of a personal digital identifier (PDI) approaching an ATM and being authenticated to access his or her information.¹ The Examiner then correctly stated that Scott in view of Davis failed to teach or suggest a policy manager component that directs the workstation to blank out the screen when a new personal digital identifier device is detected at a location within an envelope until such time as the user registered to said personal digital identifier device is biometrically identified. However, the Examiner concludes that Addy teaches these elements. In particular, the Examiner states that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ the teachings of blanking out a display within Scott’s not providing any sensitive data when a new/unauthorized PDI device user enters to a location proximity because it is very well known [in Addy] to blank out a screen from unknown users for access control security.”² For support, the Examiner cites col. 8, ll. 1-4 of Abby

Applicant believes that the Examiner is misinterpreting either the references of Scott and Addy or the claimed invention. The combination of Scott and Addy does not teach or suggest these requirements of claim 1. For example, Addy describes a remote indication device in which “the display is activated for a predetermined time enabling the user to read the display (5-10 seconds), and is then disabled prior to entering reduced current mode.”³ In fact, Addy states that the display is enabled for a predetermined “timeout period.”⁴ Addy states that “[t]hus, the display is initially enabled for only a relatively short time in order to conserve current and to limit the amount of time that the status of the security system is visible by potentially unauthorized users. Thereafter, the display will blank...”⁵

Thus, Addy makes clear that the blanking function is automatically performed at a predetermined timeout period. In Addy, the decision to “blank” the display is made solely based on expiration of the time period, and without regard to any other criteria whatsoever. Certainly, Addy fails to teach or suggest automatically blanking a screen of a currently logged-in session

¹ Office Action, page 7.

² Office Action, page 7.

³ Addy, Col. 9, ll. 61-63.

⁴ Id. at col. 9, ln. 64.

⁵ Addy, Col. 9-10, ll. 67 and 1-4.

upon detecting a *second* PDI device within range. In fact, as Addy relies exclusively on a timeout period, Addy fails to teach or suggest blanking a screen up detection of any device at all.

Moreover, as correctly recognized by the Examiner, Scott fails to provide any such teaches and, if anything, teaches quite the opposite. Scott teaches that as a user of PID 6 approaches host facility 4, e.g., an ATM (100), and reaches the range of the host facility's receiver module 38, the microprocessor is 'powered up and access is granted upon authentication.⁶ Thus, the combination of Scott in view of Addy is silent with respect to taking any action upon detecting a PID associated with a second user while a first user is currently logged-in.

Further, even if the PID system of Scott were modified to include the timeout-based blanking function of Addy, as suggested by the Examiner, the resultant system would not achieve the requirements of claim 1. Modification of the Scott system in view of the timeout-based blanking function of Addy would result in a system that authenticates a biometrically identified user to display information, and then blanks the display after expiration of a predetermined time. This combination fails to teach or suggest the elements of claim 1.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 9 and 17 differ from the references of Scott and Addy by requiring that, during a currently logged-in session of the user associated with the personal digital identifier device, a policy manager component directs at least one of the workstations to blank out a respective screen when a second personal digital identifier device is detected at a location within an envelope until such time as a user registered to said second personal digital identifier device is biometrically identified to have permission to view data of the currently logged-in session.

Second, Scott in view of the Davis and Addy fail to describe a personal digital identifier device having a processor operable for generating said *private* key held by said personal digital identifier device and outputting said generated *public* key for transmission by said transceiver, a requirement of claims 1, 9 and 17. With respect to these elements, the Examiner cited Scott at col. 10, ll.50-55. However, Scott make clear that "[t]he private encryption key is stored or loaded into PID 6 at registration time or at manufacture."⁷ That is, in Scott, the private key is

⁶ Scott, Col. 10, ll. 58-61.

⁷ Scott, Col. 10, ll. 50-52.

externally generated and then stored or loaded into the PID 6. Thus, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, this portion of Scott does not teach or suggest a personal digital identifier device that itself internally generates the private key. Similarly, neither Davis nor Addy provide any such teaching. Applicant's have recognized the possible advantages of locally generating a master template for a biometric on the portable device itself without requiring the master biometric template be transmitted to the device. The references fail to teach or suggest these features.

Dependent claims

In regard to dependent claim 8, Scott does not disclose a device holder wherein said device holder is configured to co-operate with said housing of said personal digital identifier device such that said personal digital identifier device is held by said holder device when it is appropriately positioned relative to said holder device, said device holder comprising a communications connector for communicatively coupling said personal digital identifier device directly to one said workstation when said personal digital identifier device is held by said device holder, as required by claim 8.

In regard to dependent claims 13 and 19, the combination of Scott, Davis and Addy fails to describe following said base unit's receipt of said response signal from said personal digital identifier device, transmitting from said base unit a polling signal to said personal digital identifier device for determining whether said personal digital identifier device remains located within said base unit's associated envelope, as required by claims 13 and 19.

Scott describes that "a user of PID 6 approaches host facility 4, e.g., an ATM (100). As PID 6 reaches the range of the host facility's receiver module 38, the microprocessor is 'powered up.'"⁸ However, there is no disclosure within Scott, or the other references of Davis and Abby, that motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to transmit a polling signal to said personal digital identifier device for determining whether said personal digital identifier device remains located within said base unit's associated envelope. For example, Addy provides motivation to do the opposite of the requirements of claims 13 and 19. In the disclosure of Addy, "the display will blank and if the user, prior to the lapse of the timeout period, requests a redisplay, then the contents of the confirmation message will be redisplayed without the necessity of transmitting

⁸ Scott, Col. 10, ll. 58-61.

another message to the central receiver.”⁹ This is done so that “the user is provided with an additional chance to see the display while not requiring additional power in enabling the transmitter and second receiver.”¹⁰ To conserve power as discussed in Addy, someone of ordinary skill in the art would not attempt, or be motivated, to transmit a polling signal.

In regard to dependent claims 16 and 18, Scott fails to teach that the envelop has a shape and area which are configured to encompass those locations proximate to said workstation at which an observer may read and/or understand information displayed on a screen of said workstation, as required by claims 16 and 18. Applicant believes that the Examiner may be misinterpreting either the reference of Scott or the claimed invention.

Scott teaches that a “transmitter module includes an induction loop data link, which is configured as a short-range (<0.5 m) wireless modem...”¹¹ However, any transmitter has a “range” that is not identical to an envelope specifically having a shape and area. Scott does not provide motivation to someone or ordinary skill in the art to duplicate the requirement that the envelope has a shape and area to encompass those locations proximate to said workstation. It is improper for the Examiner to pluck motivation from claims 16 and 18 instead of providing motivation from the evidentiary record.

In regard to dependent claim 21, the combination of references Scott, Davis and Addy fails to teach initially registering said user by a registrar in the presence of a guarantor, said registrar and guarantor each being a registered user of the computer network and said registrar having access to the computer network and verified by said security manager component to have registration privileges, and requiring: that said guarantor provide to said security manager component a biometrically digitally signed message to authenticate said guarantor and that each of said registrar, guarantor and user remain within said envelope during said registering of said user, as required by claim 21.

Scott discloses that “the users register by presenting themselves with their PID 6 and the required personal identification papers, which is no different than current methods of obtaining a bank card to access accounts with an ATM.”¹² However, there is no teaching that suggests that

⁹ Addy, Col. 8, ll. 4-8.

¹⁰ Addy, Col. 8, ll. 11-19.

¹¹ Scott, Col. 9, ll. 28-30.

¹² Scott, Col. 11, ll. 47-51.

each of said registrar, guarantor and user remain within said envelope during said registering of said user. The Examiner has not provided any motivation within the evidentiary record that would allow someone of ordinary skill in the art to duplicate the elements of claim 21.

For at least these reasons, the references fails to establish a prima facie case for non-patentability of Applicant's claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

All claims in this application are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number 50-1778. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney to discuss this application.

Date:

By:

May 16, 2006
SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.
8425 Seasons Parkway, Suite 105
St. Paul, Minnesota 55125
Telephone: 651.735.1100
Facsimile: 651.735.1102

Kent J. Sieffert
Name: Kent J. Sieffert
Reg. No.: 41,312